29th November 1928]

Minor Irrigation

Estates transferred from Schedule A to B under the Irrigation Cess Act after 1920.

*920 Q.—Mr. D. NARAYANA RAJU: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether any estate or estates have, after 1920, been transferred from Schedule A to Schedule B appended to the rules under section 1-A of the Madras Irrigation Cess Act, 1865; and

(b) if the answer to (a) be in the affirmative, what those estates are and what are the circumstances and reasons which necessitated such transference?

A.—(a) & (b) Nidadavole, Rasalapudi, Morta and Velivennu villages in the Bhadrachalam share of the Nidadavole estate were transferred in 1922 from Schedule A to Schedule B. The mamul wet areas in these villages had not been localized when the schedules were prepared to the rules which were issued in 1914. The transfer was ordered after the localization had been made.

Deduction allowed for baling water in the delta taluks.

*921 Q.—Mr. C. RAMASOMAYAJULU: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the amount of deduction allowed for baling water in the delta taluks and in the upland irrigation and lanka cultivation in the Godavari and Kistna deltas;

(b) on what basis the said rate is based; and

(c) whether deduction represents the whole or any fraction of actual expenses incurred by the cultivator for that purpose?

A.—(a) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to Rule I (8) printed on pages 3, 7 and 10 of Board's Standing Order, Volume II.

(b) & (c) The deduction is a concession based on long usage. Whatever may have been the case in the early days of revenue settlements it has nowadays no fixed relation to the cost of raising water.

Contribution by ryots for repairs to minor irrigation works.

*922 Q.—The ZAMINDAR OF SINGAMPATTI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the prevailing practice in the Tinnevelly district is for the Government not to undertake repairs of minor irrigation tanks without contribution from the ryots benefited by such works; and

(b) whether such practice is prevailing in other districts in the Presidency; and, if so, in which of them?

A.—(a) The contributions from ryots in the Tinnevelly district in the three years 1925–26, 1926–27 and 1927–28 amounted to Rs. 4,460, Rs. 1,965 and Rs. 3,094 respectively. The expenditure on minor irrigation works in these three years was Rs. 64,385, Rs. 1,05,777 and Rs. 72,340 respectively. The answer to the question is therefore in the negative.

(b) The figures for other districts also indicate a negative answer.